

# THE PEOPLES JOURNAL.

VOL. 6--NO. 8.

PICKENS, S. C., THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1896.

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.

## The General Assembly.

### THE METROPOLITAN POLICE LAW.

Charleston Protest Against its Enforcement.  
—Governor Evans Defended in the House  
by a Large Majority.

The amendment to the metropolitan police law was the special order for Wednesday night, and a strong debate took place, in which the course of Governor Evans was defended and the measure was sustained by a large majority.

Mr. Gadsden, of Charleston, moved to strike out the enacting words and made a speech in favor of it. He said:

Mr. Speaker: The amendment which I have just proposed to the bill for its purpose is to repeal the act passed by the Legislature at its last session and commonly known as the metropolitan police act. I cannot hope, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, to induce this House to reverse its action four years ago, but I do hope for such an expression of the opinion of the House on this measure as will indicate its disapproval of the manner in which the act has been put in operation, but even if it should fail in this respect, it should still convince the citizens of Charleston, to myself as one of their representatives, and to the people of the State at large, to regard this solemn protest against the operations of the act as our system of government; so violative of our preconceived ideas of justice and so subversive of our common liberties.

From this measure was under discussion in this House last winter, among others, pointed out what I conceived to be its injustice; and the fearful power for oppression it would vest in the Governor of the State, and the fact that it would be put in operation; that as long as a bona fide effort was being made by municipal authorities to enforce the dispensary law no danger need be feared of the operation of such municipal law being taken from their control. I will venture no statement that not one member of the House supposed that this bill, so harsh in its features, would be put into operation unless made necessary by some open resistance to the dispensary law.

At the time of the passage of this act and up to the last of December, 1895, the city government of Charleston was under the management of Mayor Pickens and his Board of Aldermen; on the first of January, 1896, Mayor Smyth was installed and before he had been given an opportunity to show his intentions as to the enforcement of the law, before even his police force had been put in operation to put him in position to carry out his views, the State Board imposed the metropolitan police system upon us. No reason has ever been assigned by the Governor or alleged by his supporters for this summary action, except that the board of aldermen had refused to pass an ordinance to enforce the dispensary law. On December 11, 1894, the city council of Charleston, in a special meeting, passed an ordinance to provide for the enforcement of the dispensary law and to punish offenses against the same.

After consideration, it was deemed advisable to amend the same so as to make the punishment cumulative, and also to cur certain technical defects which had been overlooked in the hurry of its passage—on January 22, 1895, this Act was amended by striking out Section 2, which was considered to be ultra vires; in other material respects, the ordinance was unchanged, both the original and amended ordinances provided for the appointment of municipal police for the very purpose of enforcing violations of the dispensary law. Of all of these facts the Governor was fully advised prior to the reading of his dispensary message in this House and they appear on any and every page of the report of the Board of City Council. Now has the law been enforced in Charleston; have the city authorities made an honest effort to assist the State? I am informed that Chief Constable Holly seized with the assistance of his police force 15,000 gallons of liquor in his district within the last eleven months—almost all of it in Charleston—worth at a low estimate \$20,000. Does this look like a refusal to enforce the law? Remember these seizures were made by the police upon reports by State Constables. The law has been enforced as well as it is possible to enforce it. As stated by the Senator from Edgefield, the other day, there are twenty places in South Carolina where the law is not enforced. Why is Charleston singled out as the exception? Simply to gratify personal ambition and to vent personal feelings. For the first time in the history of the State the high office of Governor of this State has been used for personal aggrandizement, for the purpose of creating a personal following. No law which has ever been placed upon the statute books of any civilized State has brought as its logical results so many evils upon a people as the dispensary law. Its poisonous breath has permeated every department of our social life, has degraded our public sentiment, has vitiated public taste, and polluted even the fountain of liberty.

It has raised up in our midst a class of palatial and luxurious homes, and it has induced the private residences of our citizens without a warrant. In its name, free born citizens of South Carolina have been tried, convicted and sentenced to the State Penitentiary, without a trial by a jury of their countrymen, and lastly, it has brought upon the proudest people on the face of the earth an indignity, an insult, which will rankle and bear fruit long after these now in sound of my voice shall have been gathered to their fathers.

In addition to the evils of the dispensary law just pointed out, no thoughtful citizen can fail to appreciate the still greater evil of the enormous concentration of power in the hands of the Governor. It has built up an army of employees, responsible to the Governor alone, for their appointment, dependent solely upon his

favor for the intention of their positions; a nucleus of personal followers and retainers is implanted in every county around which the supporters of the incumbent of the office of chief executive will rally to aid. This one man power, this concentration of the prerogatives of the many in the hands of one to be used for purposes of personal advancement is the most serious menace to a republican form of government. A Governor once firmly entrenched in office can defy the will of the people and rest secure in the support of this army of retainers; already this evil has been recognized by this House in passing a bill to elect a board of commissioners by the Legislature and the election of the commissioners by the people. Not content with this, the metropolitan police act delivers into his hands the organized police force of every city and town in this State; true, it provides that such law shall only be imposed when the dispensary law is not enforced, but that with law is not enforced, but that the fact that the metropolitan police law is in operation is so great to be resisted by a man of ambition, working for political advancement. This wish is father to the thought and the desire to increase political patronage by the use of the metropolitan police law creates the conviction that the condition exists which alone justifies its imposition. I repeat—It is time for thoughtful men all over this State, to resist the metropolitan police law, to consider the tendency of these laws to be enacted—its full purpose and effect is just becoming apparent; pushed to their logical result, they create a one man's power in South Carolina, and it is possible for the will of the people to be expressed in the choice of their public men. It is an immense army independent of the people, regardless of their wishes, dependent for their positions, not upon their services, but upon the favor of one man and the Governor of the State. Compared with this system, the State House ring, which was popularly supposed to exist heretofore, is too insignificant to permit of comparison; indeed a ring in its most obnoxious phase, whose members are bound irrevocably together by pecuniary consideration, and all under the absolute dependent upon Governor, who should be independent of the people alone for the enjoyment of his office.

There is no spot on this continent which has borne more in the cause of freedom and liberty than Charleston. She has been the home of the persecuted and the oppressed. The Huguenots fleeing from the fair shores of France found a welcome there, and the colonists of New England, restive under the restrictions of the British, sought the freedom of our laws. Her sons have made the name of South Carolina illustrious and have whenever called upon laid down their lives in the defense of liberty and self-government. She has survived the calamities of war, fire, cyclone, earthquake and financial panic and has continued to contribute her quota to the prosperity and happiness of the State, and yet, in the history of our country, through the personal agency of one man, she has been reduced to a condition of political life, for the exigencies of personal and partisan strife—this great injustice has been put upon her. I can not believe, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, that you will approve of such a course. I can not believe you will impose upon us an indignity you would not place upon yourselves. After the grand awakening of public sentiment by the constitutional convention, when, after many years, South Carolina met again as brothers; when past differences were obliterated and forgotten and a new purpose recorded to unite in one common effort—for the advancement of our loved State; when we had succeeded in preserving this State for the white man forever, it was a rude awakening from the security into which the State had been lulled to find that there were in our State three men so blind to the evils which were occurring, so deaf to the pleas of an ennobled public sentiment, so wanting in appreciation of the influences which were at work as to be capable of this injustice. I will not detain you longer, gentlemen, in discussing the features of this Act. I pointed out its features that in every other State in this Union where a metropolitan police system was in operation, the mayor appointed the commissioners. Under this Act we are required to pay the taxpayers for their money; the financial officers of the city are not allowed to vouch the accounts and expenditures of the board. They may be given no authority to enforce the law of the city—but I do not propose to offer amendments to this bill; our people desire to have no part in it whatever. We are not responsible for its enactment and we will not share the responsibility for its operation.

One more word. We are about to part; the closing hours of this Legislature are fast approaching. I have not intended to criticize the action of this body in the exercise of their judgment. I am satisfied it was honestly done. Whenever the Legislature meets in the future, we will see that a similar operation with which you gentlemen have nothing to do. We can only hope that the great common people of South Carolina—the source of all our liberties—will see that a succeeding Legislature will right the injustice which has been done.

Mr. Watson said he had listened quietly to the gentlemen and he found a great deal to be said. He represented the farmers, the mechanics, the laborers, the fields, again, and that those who have ruled and dominated South Carolina and laid their withering hand on the poor farmer, will again come to these halls and we will have to plow on. He spoke of his experience in the Legislature in 1881, when the members of Charleston had full sway and they had little regard for our feelings. He rejoiced that the day had come when we had free speech and could come to this hall and express our honest views. He voted for the metropolitan police law, somewhat under protest, but also because of the infraction of the law in that city. It was a heroic remedy but it was a heroic disease. The Governor waited patiently for these cities and towns to faithfully execute the laws of the State. He thought the Governor violated it than any other city. The

lash was applied to her because of her persistence in violation of the law. Why then these reflections upon the intelligence and patriotism of the majority of this body? We have always sympathized with Charleston except when she violated the law. It will become them to make such insinuations. If gentlemen will not pursue a different policy they must accept the inevitable. If Charleston wants to be in sympathy with the rest of the State and other municipalities let her enforce the law. If you would have us be kind to us, give us pleasant words rather than undertake to reprimand and abuse us.

Mr. Floyd expressed regret that this debate should be injected at the close of the session and arouse hard feelings. But when the gentleman charges the Governor of the State with personal motives in putting the metropolitan police law on Charleston, he would deny that most emphatically. Charleston has defied the law. Blind tigers are in open violation of the law. It is not Charleston alone is responsible for the law being put upon her. There would have been no necessity for the metropolitan police law had Charleston obeyed the law and he warned them that unless they did so the law would be even more severely applied.

Mr. Bacoit held that the people of South Carolina were all brothers of a common blood and while he did not think the dispensary law a wise one still he had always advised all with whom he came in contact that the law should be obeyed until it was repealed. This metropolitan bill was taxation without representation for these commissioners are appointed without the city having a voice, yet the citizens are compelled to tax themselves to pay any bills they may see fit to order. Speaking of the Charleston primary election bill he said it was a partisan measure which in connection with the metropolitan police measure, compels him to believe that it was only a pretext to cover an intention to change the political sentiments of Charleston if possible.

He said that the people of Charleston were not united in adversity and the proud people of his city had not been broken even when adversity was heaped upon her by the hand of God. And shall we quail before an adversity placed on us by the hand of man? He thought that in many respects the force of the bill sank into insignificance in comparison with some of the provisions of these bills. The force of the bill did not take away every vestige of home rule and economy as they do. In conclusion he said that he was not a seceder, but he thought people have only equal rights and privileges with other people.

The ayes and noes were demanded on Mr. Gadsden's amendment which was rejected by a vote of 78 to 17.

Those voting for the amendment were Messrs. Adams, Ashley, Bacoit, Breckland, Devereaux, Johnson, B. J. Pyatt, Saunders, A. K., Thomas, Weston, Wilson, Mohrtons, Mollette, Manning, Dethlefsen, and others.

Mr. Crum moved to strike out the provision requiring the commissioners to report to the Mayor the list of appointments, removals, etc. He said one member of the city council had already been indicted for running a blind tiger and when Aldermen are guilty of such violations they should not be informed who the special detectives are. Speaking of Charleston's patriotism, he said he had no objection to a blind tiger but it was not for only a year or two ago when she was called upon to suppress a riot she threw down her arms.

He moved to amend, however, requiring the Chief to report to the Mayor.

Mr. Shuman moved an amendment that when any city or town is put under the provisions of the bill that such city shall receive the dispensary proceeds.

Mr. Crum thought that question was fully covered by the present dispensary law.

Mr. Breazeale agreed with Mr. Shuman.

Mr. Watson didn't want to offer any inducements for having metropolitan police and he thought the amendment might do that.

Mr. Blackwell thought the amendment a just one.

Mr. Devereaux said that judging from the legislation now going on in Charleston, he concluded that Charleston is South Carolina, as all of it seems to be directed at her. The amendment was adopted and the bill was passed.

### AMENDING THE DISPENSARY LAW.

Changing the State Board of Control—The Local Option Feature Was Lost by One Vote.

The morning session of the Senate was mainly devoted to the consideration of Mr. Efrid's substitute for the House bill providing for the election, duties and compensation of the commissioners of the dispensary and the further regulation of the sale of liquors. There were a great many committee amendments adopted, as well as a number offered by Senators on the floor.

Mr. Jordan opposed the committee amendment to the dispensary bill providing for a State board of control of five men, not State officers. He thought there should be a purchasing power here in Columbia. It was unnecessary to have a board of control scattered over the State. It would strengthen the constitutionality of the bill; in his opinion it would have an exactly opposite effect. He was not a friend to the dispensary, but as a Senator he would not see the State put in a position of doing something which would make her laughed at.

Mr. Efrid said the Attorney General had asked for the insertion of these words in the bill.

Mr. Mayfield thought that the objection of Mr. Jordan could be removed by electing one or two members of the board from Columbia. He did not see the use of having the board scattered all over the State and thought there was enough Democracy, even Reform, in Columbia for a selection to be made. He would be in favor of putting a Conservative on the board, as he was opposed to the expansion of the business.

Mr. Mayfield—I would favor having on the board the strongest prohibitionists in the State.

Mr. Jordan's motion to amend was lost to a large majority.

Mr. Finley offered an amendment requiring the city dispensers to make weekly settlements with the county treasurer. The bill provided that they should make such settlements direct with the State treasurer. Mr. Finley held that this was requiring too much of the State treasurer's office. That officer should only have to look at the head of the dispensary system.

Mr. Efrid argued in favor of settlements being made direct to the State treasurer.

Mr. Finley's motion was lost by a vote of 16 to 10.

Mr. Finley offered an amendment providing for something like local option. If the majority of qualified electors in any county voted against the dispensary, then liquor should only be sold in that county for medicinal, mechanical and sacramental purposes. It was practically the same bill which was killed the night before, except that the latter had reference only to cities and towns.

Mr. Efrid did not deny that the tendency of the dispensary had been to increase the sale of liquor and this bill was drawn for the purpose of checking that tendency. If the Legislature elected five gentlemen on the board of control, it would not be the original plans of the dispensary, the curtailment of such sales would certainly follow. He was in life and opinion a prohibitionist, but he could not obtain absolute prohibition; they had tried that and it had failed in one day; they must go inch by inch. Let this bill go into effect and from year to year the sales could become less objectionable to those opposed to the sale of liquor.

Mr. Efrid said his amendment was plain and simple. The Senator from Lexington knew there were some sections of South Carolina where liquor was sold, where people were opposed to the sale of liquor as a beverage. The sale of liquor was now the object of the dispensary, and if it was kept up, it would be a stench in the nostrils of the people.

Mr. Mayfield was a natural prohibitionist, but prohibition was not practicable. The dispensary law had been violated by dispensers; they had sold liquor to drunkards and minors, but it was proposed to put further safeguards around the sales. Mr. Mayfield made quite a speech in favor of the dispensary.

Mr. Archer thought it idle to talk of prohibition. The public sentiment was not sufficiently in favor of it to make it successful. What was the purpose of the dispensary? If prohibition was possible? It was possible as long as the old bartenders had sympathies in the State, sympathies among the judges. He did not think there was a town in South Carolina which had tried to enforce the metropolitan police, and he thought it an injustice to single out Charleston to put that system in force. The police of Spartanburg were opposed to the dispensary. If this amendment passed, there would have to be metropolitan police in every town to keep down blind tigers, and he was opposed to some people having to pay to try and keep other people who wanted to drink blind tigers from going to hell.

Mr. Archer spoke of his knowledge of an unholy alliance which existed last year between preachers and old barroom men in an effort to defeat the dispensary law.

Mr. Watson had never tasted whiskey, but he believed that the dispensary was the solution. There would be less drinking when the law was enforced. He had seen in a Columbia dispensary negroes standing three deep in front of the counter and being served and no question asked. He wanted the law strictly enforced.

Mr. Pottigrow was surprised at the opposition to this amendment by those who acknowledge the abuses of the law.

Mr. Archer's motion to lay Mr. Efrid's amendment on the table, the vote was as follows:

Yeas—Archer, Barton, Brice, Brown, Douglass, Efrid, Jordan, Mayfield, McCalla, McDaniel, Norris, O'Dell, Ragin, Sanders, Stribling, Walker, Williams, Watson, etc.

Yeas—Archer, Brice, Douglass, DuBose, Efrid, Fuller, Jordan, Mayfield, McCalla, Norris, Pottigrow, Ragin, Sanders, Stackhouse, Stribling, Watson, Williams, etc.

Nays—Barnwell, Dennis, Moses, Turner, Verrier—5.

The bill then passed its third reading, after being under consideration for three hours.

### FREE TUITION IN COLLEGES.

Shall the State Institutions be Kept Open for all Students Without Charge?

The night session of the Senate was one of lively and interesting debate. The educational bill was up for consideration, and this measure never before had so many friends.

Mr. Efrid offered an amendment that all pupils should pay an annual tuition of \$30 a year.

Mr. McCalla offered an amendment making the tuition \$25 a year.

Mr. Watson said we are giving too much toward higher education; that we are spending money for twenty-four per cent. of the pupils while seventy-six per cent. are going without aid. He said there were some officers who were afraid to deal fairly with the question. Every man who had no office was expecting to run for one. He said we were paying \$300 a year each for boys to get an academic education. The State said to every boy, "We will pay five dollars to your education where you pay one." Self reliance was the first principle of republicanism, and we should teach our young men to rely upon themselves for a part of their education. It was an idle dream to expect a rural college in the South till we could get on our feet.

If Clemson was maintained as a Mechanical and Agricultural College, if it was strictly a technological school as intended, it would not step on anybody's toes—it would do the legitimate work for which it was created, and our colleges would get along harmoniously.

Mr. McCalla: "You speak of our colleges? Did 'our colleges ever go into the highways and hedges for poor boys and attempt to educate them?'"

Mr. Watson: "I don't exactly understand you. The fact is, only one poor man out of every thousand goes to our colleges. It was an idle dream to expect a real college in the South till we could get on our feet."

Mr. Norris said while he agreed with the gentleman from Edgefield on many points, they had tried to frame a bill to meet the exigencies of all occasions. The bill proposed was a compromise. They had to distinguish between the indigent and those able to pay; to offer beneficiaries was unfair to some, and to admit all free second-class citizens would combine and wipe out our institutions.

Mr. Watson said of the 65,000 pupils in the colleges only 15,000 were in State colleges. He wanted the State institutions to be self-sustaining but to substitute the work done by other colleges.

Mr. McCalla said he was not here representing colleges, but his people. The argument of Mr. Watson, he said, proved that the State had been negligent in its duty. There were no other colleges doing the work of Clemson and Rock Hill. When he saw the poor boys and girls collected from every section and sent to these colleges, he thanked God for a B. R. Tillman. These young people could never have gone elsewhere. The preparatory department at Clemson merely showed the impossibility of properly preparing those boys for college.

Mr. Archer said Mr. McCalla's queer argument meant that the State could not compete with the denominational colleges, and that because rich men paid the taxes they should have the benefit of their taxes.

Mr. McCalla: I beg pardon, but I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. Archer: Your argument said it. Is it necessary to pay \$300 each in order that young men may learn to read and write? We have begun to build at the top, he said. From a political standpoint, we had come here as Reformers, old rasnals. We had run into office on the poor man's college, but the poor man had footed the bill to the tune of \$912,000.

Mr. McCalla asked what the old crowd did for the poor boys of the State?

Mr. Archer said if they did not build any schools, they didn't waste thousands of dollars playing big like in spending money for brick and mortar.

In the passage of the appropriation bill, Senator Watson moved to strike out the provision requiring free tuition in the South Carolina College for two young men from each county in the State.

Mr. Moses and Mr. Finley denied that such was the policy of the State, and thought that the amendment should not be adopted. To deprive the poor boys of this State of such a privilege would be legislating for a class.

There is no school without a teacher that could not get fifty applications for the place in a week. You don't need these men for teachers.

He said the South Carolina College wanted \$2,000 for repairs, although they say the buildings are in good repair; and \$800 to teach men to turn summersaults. The people were promised \$3 per capita for their children, but they would not get \$2. The State had spent over a million dollars in a few years for higher education and Clemson got \$100,000.

Mr. Norris said that he could not let such remarks go unanswered. Such statements were wild.

Mr. Watson was a friend of Clemson College, and boasted of it; but the college would get \$100,000 from all sources under this appropriation bill; \$300 a year for boys, many in academic work. He said that he did not intend to raise a question about the appropriation, and would not have any tuition, but was opposed to giving 72 boys free tuition.

He protested and he expected to continue a protest against a poor State as South Carolina expending \$200,000 for higher education, with 15,000 white voters not able to read their ballots.

Mr. Mayfield was opposed to the amendment. He had listened to Mr. Watson's arguments time and time again. He was glad to hear the gentleman say he favored education, but was surprised at his votes. He was surprised to hear him say the State did not need more teachers. If he was so earnest for the education of the masses why has he not attempted to do more in his county? It was easier to tear down than to build up. The money given to Clemson College was not for running expenses but for equipment—buildings and permanent work. There were not young boys at Clemson—the youngest was 15 and the oldest 30.

Mr. Mayfield went on to show how Clemson enabled many a poor boy to get an education, and the grand work it was doing. He was willing to support all these colleges liberally.

Mr. Watson wished to see South Carolina College and the Citadel live on forever. Clemson was safe. He said the president of Clemson wanted \$11,000 appropriation for professor's salaries and it was too much. He should not tolerate such extravagance.

Mr. Moses asked if Thomas Jefferson did not establish the Virginia University with a view of having free tuition? He was in favor of free tuition and it had always worked out as a rule.

The motion to lay Mr. Watson's amendment on the table was adopted by the following vote:

Yeas—Barnwell, Brice, Bulist, Dennis, Efrid, Fuller, Harrison, Jordan, Mayfield, Miller, Moses, Mower, McCalla, Norris, O'Dell, Ragin, Sloan, Stackhouse, Stribling, Walker—20.

Nays—Archer, Barton, Brown, Pottigrow, Derham, Douglass, DuBose, Efrid, McDaniel, McDaniel, Turner, Williams, Watson—12.

### THE NEW DISPENSARY LAW.

The Amendments Were Rushed Through the House—The Bill Finally Passed.

When the dispensary bill was called up, Mr. Efrid wanted it considered by the House as a committee of the whole, in order, he said, to accept its good features and reject its bad ones. This was the only way to do this as the bill was a Senate amendment.

Mr. Efrid said there were some features of the bill, which he opposed, but it was important that some law be passed and the House had no time to go into conferences on the bill.

In Section 2 a sentence was found which read: "The bill shall be read and the manuscript bill be read exactly the same."

Mr. L. J. Williams wanted the chair to rule whether either House could correct a clerical error.

The chair ruled that it could only be done by a conference committee.

Mr. Sturkie thought the best thing to do was to go into a committee of the whole and make these corrections.

He made a motion to that effect, which was agreed to by the House. The chair called to the chair and Mr. Manning nominated Speaker Gary as chairman, which was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. W. J. Johnston the salary of the commissioner was made \$1,800 instead of \$2,500.

Mr. Watson moved an amendment permitting the board of control to have liquors analyzed either by the chemist of the South Carolina College or Clemson College.

Mr. Thomas raised the point that while the House was sitting the mace should be removed from the Speaker's desk. The point was ruled to be well taken and the mace was placed under the reporters' table.

A number of amendments were about to be offered when Mr. L. J. Williams said that perhaps many of the amendments were not completed during the day and as the House had to elect a board of control and good men ought to be selected without any rush and he moved that the committee rise, which was agreed to.

Judge Townsend in speaking of the clerical errors, said that he would stake his professional reputation that the court would construe the sentences in their true intent and meaning and he thought the House could adopt the Senate amendments without fault.

Mr. Bacoit moved that the amendments of the committee on the whole be adopted and referred to the committee of conference to be later appointed. This was tabled on motion of Mr. L. J. Williams and the reading of the bill was resumed.

It was ten minutes to 1 when the reading was completed, and Mr. Breazeale moved that the House do not concur in order. A committee of conference was then appointed.

Mr. Bacoit said that he simply wished to state one single objection to the bill in addition to others he had. By its provisions no mother or housekeeper of the State can keep a bottle of blackberry jam or a plum cordial without being subject to the whims of the State. He believed any right minded man could vote to bring the women of the State into the vortex of this legislation which had so vexed her sons. He asked that he be allowed to spread his reasons upon the journal.

After some discussion the chair appointed Messrs. Breazeale, Shuman and L. J. Williams a committee of conference on the bill.

The committee on conference on the dispensary bill reported that they had considered the same and could not agree. A committee on free conference was appointed, the members from the House being Messrs. Townsend, Rowland and Rainford.

The committee on free conference on the dispensary bill reported that they had agreed. The salary of the commissioner remains at \$2,500 instead of \$1,800 as the House wanted it. The other amendments consisted of the correction of clerical errors generally.

The chief feature of the new law is that the Legislature shall elect a board of control of five members who shall elect the commissioner. They have control of all purchases, etc.

Mr. Efrid said that he had seen in the Atlanta Almanac for the year 1895, stating that he was born in Union county, N. C. as was the name of Hutchinson. I corrected that mistake forty years ago. He was born in one-quarter of a mile of Waxhaw meeting house (Presbyterian), Lancaster county, S. C. His mother's maiden name was Crawford, closely related to the Crawford of the Tegers, as will be seen further on. Sometime between 1785 and 1790, several members of the Waxhaw church moved to Ben's creek, including the Moores, Haddons, McCords, Coons and Weeks. The Moore and Haddon children went to school where Gen. Jackson did, and their parents were members of the Waxhaw church where Mrs. Jackson's membership was.

My mother was a Haddon and went to the same school. Her father's residence was only one-quarter of a mile from Mrs. Jackson's. Eaton's "Life of Jackson" says his mother was a Crawford and that he was born at Waxhaw, Lancaster county, S. C. That was the first life of Jackson written. I have seen it hundreds of times stated in that book. Eaton was afterwards a member of Jackson's cabinet. Jackson's proclamation against nullification called for the waters of the Tegers. His mother died after he had entered his teens, and she had, no doubt, made him aware of her maiden name and the place of her nativity.

I have stated I would show the relationship between the Teger Crawfords and Gen. Jackson. The waters of the Tegers introduced to an old gentleman by the name of Crawford, a native of Abbeville, S. C. He told me he was a nephew of Patrick Crawford, who was killed by mistake of two whig parties during the war of 1861-62, and was lying at each other before the mistake was found out. He was then a resident of Pontotoc, Miss. He invited me home with him and he told me he could show me, in Gen. Jackson's own handwriting, a letter from the Teger himself and Patrick Crawford first cousins. I was sorry I could not accept the invitation. When I got home I found the senior members of the Crawford connection knew it, but knowing they might be criticized for not saying anything about it, I hope, Mr. Editor, that the South Carolina historian will see that this is placed in its proper place. The changing his mother's name from Crawford to Hutchinson shows something wrong. The North Carolina claim to the honor of his birth is groundless. This North Carolina claim is nothing new to me. I know the parties that gave that information. The same parties gave the information that Jackson could hardly read or write and was a sadder by trade. A Bishop Potter used some of that information in a centennial address and got himself compared to a certain long-eared animal by Dana, of the New York Sun. The Teger's speech in the United States Senate in 1826, to show Jackson was the best qualified by education and administrative ability to be the President of the United States. The Teger staff at the head of Jackson's brilliant staff at New Orleans and afterwards his Premier, and had the reputation of being the best lawyer in the United States.

—The Yorkville Enquirer notes the death of General Lewis Merrill, which occurred in the Presbyterian hospital, Philadelphia, last Thursday morning, as the result of a kidney affection. Merrill was post commandant at Yorkville during the war of 1861-62, and in the early '70's, and in this position became notorious. His energy was equal only by his unscrupulousness, and as the result, the Ku-Klux organization was soon broken up, and the gully, along with perhaps many of the innocent, were convicted before Judge Bond. Before Merrill's arrival, Governor Scott offered a reward of \$200 for each capture and conviction of a Ku-Klux, and under this offer Merrill collected something like \$20,000. By his action in taking the money he lost caste to a large extent in the army. When located in Yorkville he was a major but several years ago he was retired as a general. Except in connection with this promotion, retirement and death he has hardly been heard of since he left Yorkville.

—The Yorkville Enquirer notes the death of General Lewis Merrill, which occurred in the Presbyterian hospital, Philadelphia, last Thursday morning, as the result of a kidney affection. Merrill was post commandant at Yorkville during the war of 1861-62, and in the early '70's, and in this position became notorious. His energy was equal only by his unscrupulousness, and as the result, the Ku-Klux organization was soon broken up, and the gully, along with perhaps many of the innocent, were convicted before Judge Bond. Before Merrill's arrival, Governor Scott offered a reward of \$200 for each capture and conviction of a Ku-Klux, and under this offer Merrill collected something like \$20,000. By his action in taking the money he lost caste to a large extent in the army. When located in Yorkville he was a major but several years ago he was retired as a general. Except in connection with this promotion, retirement and death he has hardly been heard of since he left Yorkville.

—The Yorkville Enquirer notes the death of General Lewis Merrill, which occurred in the Presbyterian hospital, Philadelphia, last Thursday morning, as the result of a kidney affection. Merrill was post commandant at Yorkville during the war of 1861-62, and in the early '70's, and in this position became notorious. His energy was equal only by his unscrupulousness, and as the result, the Ku-Klux organization was soon broken up, and the gully, along with perhaps many of the innocent, were convicted before Judge Bond. Before Merrill's arrival, Governor Scott offered a reward of \$200 for each capture and conviction of a Ku-Klux, and under this offer Merrill collected something like \$20,000. By his action in taking the money he lost caste to a large extent in the army. When located in Yorkville he was a major but several years ago he was retired as a general. Except in connection with this promotion, retirement and death he has hardly been heard of since he left Yorkville.

—The Yorkville Enquirer notes the death of General Lewis Merrill, which occurred in the Presbyterian hospital, Philadelphia, last Thursday morning, as the result of a kidney affection. Merrill was post commandant at Yorkville during the war of 1861-62, and in the early '70's, and in this position became notorious. His energy was equal only by his unscrupulousness, and as the result, the Ku-Klux organization was soon broken up, and the gully, along with perhaps many of the innocent, were convicted before Judge Bond. Before Merrill's arrival, Governor Scott offered a reward of \$200 for each capture and conviction of a Ku-Klux, and under this offer Merrill collected something like \$20,000. By his action in taking the money he lost caste to a large extent in the army. When located in Yorkville he was a major but several years ago he was retired as a general. Except in connection with this promotion, retirement and death he has hardly been heard of since he left Yorkville.

—The Yorkville Enquirer notes the death of General Lewis Merrill, which occurred in the Presbyterian hospital, Philadelphia, last Thursday morning, as the result of a kidney affection. Merrill was post commandant at Yorkville during the war of 1861-62, and in the early '70's, and in this position became notorious. His energy was equal only by his unscrupulousness, and as the result, the Ku-Klux organization was soon broken up